

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,499 08/01/2003		Frank Olschewski	21295.59(H5644US)	4405
<sup>29127</sup> HOUSTON EL	7590 11/30/2007 LISEEVA		EXAMINER	
4 MILITIA DRIVE, SUITE 4			ROSARIO, DENNIS	
LEXINGTON,	MA 02421		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/632,499	OLSCHEWSKI, FRANK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis Rosario	2624	

	Dennis Rosario	2624	,			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 15 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exampler 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	• •					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	iected claims				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		jecieu cialilis.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ampliant Amendment	(DTOL 224)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		omphant Amendinent	(I TOL-324).			
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	timely filed amendme	ent cancoling the			
non-allowable claim(s).	nowable if subjinitied in a separate,	uniely liled amending	in canceing the			
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proof the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attact	ned.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered beautiful See attached Response to After Final Amendment.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).					
13.  Other:	·					
		•				
•		•				

10/632,499 Art Unit: 2624

## Résponse to After Final Amendment

The after final amendment was received on 11/15/07. Claims 1-11 are pending.
 Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments on page 6,3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph filed 11/15/07 have been fully considered and states:
  - "...the acquired images are images acquired by a detector unit, a video system, or a CCD sensor from a specimen, as opposed to images formed by processing 9e.g. single-or multi-stage filtering, compressing, decompressing, reconstruction, enhancing, etc.) of the acquired images."

Thus, the acquired images or the claimed "acquiring images" of claim 1, appear to de redefined as:

images acquired by a detector unit, a video system, or a CCD sensor from a specimen, as opposed to images formed by processing (e.g. single-or multi-stage filtering, compressing, decompressing, reconstruction, enhancing, etc.) of the acquired images.

Thus, if applicant's requests that a Broadest Reasonable Interpretation (MPEP 2111) be enacted instead of Plain Meaning (2111.01), then the examiner will use the redefined meaning of acquired images and apply the meaning to Fogg. Until notified that the Broadest Reasonable Interpretation be enacted, the examiner will assume Plain Meaning for the remainder of the remarks.

10/632,499

Art Unit: 2624

3. Applicant's arguments on page 7,5<sup>th</sup> paragraph have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and states:

"Fogg does not disclose determining a trajectory for each pixel of acquired images."

The examiner respectfully disagrees since Fogg as claimed in claim 1 does disclose "identifying a trajectory for each pixel (via fig. 10C,num. 1026) of the acquired images (fig. 4: Source Bitstream)."

Note that the Source Bitsteam represents a group of frames that are acquired by fig. 4, num. 401 according to plain meaning. If applicant wish to enact the Broadest Reasonable Interpretation, the examiner will have to find another disclosure of acquiring images since fig. 4,num. 401 is a decode-subsystem that does not meet the criteria of the redefined "acquiring images" that requires a detector unit or a video system or a CCD sensor in order to acquire images.

- 4. Applicant's arguments on page 8, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and states:
  - "...Fogg does not disclose applying an operation to the acquired images..."

Application/Control Number:

10/632,499 Art Unit: 2624

The examiner respectfully disagree since Fogg does disclose as claimed an operation (fig. 11F, num. 1056) to the acquired images (as represented in fig. 11A as "Reconstr. Frame Data") along the identified trajectory (as identified previously in fig. 6, num. 606 the method of which is shown in fig. 10C wherein the claimed trajectory is identified in num. 1026).

- 5. In response to applicant's arguments on page 8, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph the recitation "microscopes...are not mentioned...in Fogg" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).
- 6. Applicant's arguments on page 8,3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and states:

"Claim 1 is a method for optimizing the image quality of movable subjects imaged with a microscope system comprising determining a respective displacement vector from the acquired images and trajectory for pixels of the acquired images and applying an operation to the same acquired images along the trajectory. This combination of elements is not found in Fogg..."

10/632,499 Art Unit: 2624

The examiner respectfully disagree since Fogg does disclose:

- a) determining (via fig. 6,num. 606 the method of which is shown in figures 10B and 10C)
  - a respective displacement vector (upon the output of fig. 6, num.606 and in fig. 10C, num. 1029) from the acquired images (fig. 6,num. 652) and
  - a2) trajectory (fig. 10C,num. 1026) for pixels of the acquired images and
- b) applying an operation (fig. 11F,num. 1056) to the same acquired images (fig. 6,num. 652 and in fig. 11A: Reconstr. Frame Data that corresponds to fig. 11F and "multiple frames" in col. 18, line 41 which are the claimed acquired images) along the trajectory (since a "Trace" operation in fig. 11F,num. 1054 is being used along the trajectory to identify features temporally within the multiple frames.)
- 7. Applicant's arguments on page 9 with respect to claims 6 and 10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive since claims 6 and 10 are directed towards a microscope and not "elements of determining a respective displacement vector (remarks, lines 3,4)"; thus, the examiner is not sure what the applicant's arguments are with respect to claims 6 and 10.

Application/Control Number:

10/632,499 Art Unit: 2624 Page 6

## Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Rosario whose telephone number is (571) 272-7397. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on (571) 272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dennis Rosario Unit 2624

> MATTHEW C. BELLA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Markon C. Bella